REMARKS

The above amendment to the description is based lines 10-11 of claim 4 as originally filed. Thus, examination will indicate that the above amendment to the description does not introduce any new matter.

In claim 1, "identifiers" has been changed to --indicators-- in order to be consistent with the specification and the other claims. The change just fixes a grammatical error and does not change the scope of the claim. Added "corresponding to a data object" just to functionally connect the path object to the data object. Other changes just correct grammatical errors. These changes are not required for patentability, because those skilled in the art would understand the claim in view of the description without these changes.

In claim 2, added --of-- just to correct a grammatical error. The change is not required for patentability because those skilled in the art would understand the claim in view of the description without these changes.

In claim 3, broadened claim by making it dependent on claim 1, and corrected grammatical errors including the correspondence between the queue and the result. The change is not required for patentability because those skilled in the art would understand the claim in view of the description without these changes.

In claim 4, added "second" to provide an antecedent for claim 5. The change is not required for patentability because those skilled in the art would understand Claims 4 and 5 in view of the specification without these changes.

In claim 5, added "second" to make explicit an inherent limitation of the claim that the performing and identifying steps referred to in claim 5 are the performing and identifying steps of claim 1 that are related to the second queue. The change is not

required for patentability because those skilled in the art would understand the claim in view of the description without these changes.

In claim 7, changed "a subprocess" to --processing-- to broaden the claim. Also added "the processing object indicator" to be consistent with claim 6 on which this claim depends. Added --result-- before "indication" to be redundant. The change is not required for patentability because those skilled in the art would understand the claim in view of the description without these changes.

In response to the rejection of claims 4-5 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, alleging that "modifying said indicator part of said first data object to produce a second data object;" in claim 4, is not described in the specification, is without merit because claim 4 is a part of the specification as filed. See the above amendment to the description where "Indicators 181,182 for data object 110 may be modified during the processing to produce another data object (not shown)" has been added to the description.

In response to the rejection of claims 8-11 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, alleging that "Changing the queue indicator to indicate a second queue" is without merit because that is disclosed in the specification by "modifying said indicator part of said first data object to produce a second data object;" in claim 4, which is part of the specification as originally filed. See the above amendment to the description.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, alleging that "the processing objects" lacks antecedent basis, there is no statutory requirement for antecedent basis. The phrase "the processing objects" is not in the claim. The preamble includes "one processing object to another" which is proper antecedent basis for "said processing objects".

In response to the rejection of claims 6-7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, alleging that the phrase "the said path objects" lacks antecedent basis, there is no statutory requirement for antecedent basis and lack of antecedent basis does not render the claim otherwise indefinite. The phrase "the said path objects" is not in claim 6. The claim has been amended to correct grammatical errors and I believe that this rejection is moot in view of the amendment.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-9 and 11 under 35 USC 103(c) for allegedly being unpatentable over US6553427 to Chang, the applicant traverses the rejection because the citation does not suggest all the elements of the rejected claims.

More specifically, the citation does not suggest "a queue corresponding to a second of said processing objects" as in claim 1. The only queue in the Chang citation is the message queue. Claims 2-3 and 11 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

The citation does not suggest "modifying said indicator part of said first data object to produce a second data object" as in claim 4. There is no indicator part disclosed in the Chang citation. Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

The citation does not suggest "path objects containing an indicator of at least one of said second and third processing object" as in claim 6. There are not indicator of a processing object disclosed in the Chang citation. Claim 7 is dependent on claim 6 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

In response to the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103(c) for allegedly being unpatentable over US6553427 to Chang in view of US6446134 to Nakamura, the applicant traverses the rejection because the combination of citations does not suggest "the path object includes a table of queue indicators" as in claim 10. The

busy flag field of Nakamura is not an object because it does not include both data and functions that access the data.

"Object" is specifically defined in the specification, for example, starting at page 2, line 22 "Objects actually contain code (sequences of computer instructions) and data (information which the instructions operate on). Also, at page 3, lines 8-9 as "In O-O programming, code and data are merged into a single indivisible thing - - an object." The examiner may not ignore specific definitions of terms in the description of the application.

The claims are definite and distinguished from the citations and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By _Michael E. Belk_

Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Patent Attorney
(914) 333-9643

N:\USERPUBLIC\BE\PA\US\US000345_AM1.DOC